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The effort to develop the Pikes Peak Multi-Use Plan was directed by the Managing Partners, a group composed of all resource management agencies and local municipalities throughout the 168 square mile planning area. The Managing Partners and Planning Team are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs Utilities - Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service Pikes Peak Ranger District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Division of Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Manitou Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Woodland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Cripple Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Green Mountain Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Victor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikes Peak - America’s Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Planning Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Workshop, Inc. Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas and Thomas Colorado Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Natural Heritage Program Fort Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsburg Holt &amp; Ullevig Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Watson Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Olgeirson Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTM Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; Veatch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

- Pikes Peak is a public landscape of national prominence
- Need a balance between preservation of critical water and other natural resources, and desires for recreational access requires a comprehensive regional planning effort.
- Based upon strong public involvement to achieve a new standard
- The Pikes Peak Multi-Use Plan is a long-range vision that will continually be updated overtime so that it remains useful and correct.
Purposes of Plan

• establish a vision and a set of guidelines that directs and maintains a program to prevent damaging the existing natural resources
• create a Pikes Peak region plan based on common community values
• accommodate recreational activity and protect natural and cultural resources for future generations
• test and connect Regional Vision Plan with practical strategies for implementation and management
• integrate existing local facilities and features on public and private lands into common vision and management philosophy
Planning Process

- Engaged unprecedented public participation that included public surveys, meetings, a Citizen's Advisory Group, newsletters, and a web site
- A Citizen's Advisory Group (CAG) scheduled public meetings
- Complex resource planning issues were addressed by a Technical Advisory Group of local resource planners
- The resulting product: A Regional Vision Plan, gained broad support from participants:
  - 94 percent of the Citizen's Advisory Group endorsing the plan
Planning Steps

- Public surveys and meetings
- Citizens Advisory Group
- Technical Advisory Group
- Created a detailed inventory of natural and cultural resources:
  - the *Pikes Peak Atlas*
- Carried out analysis to define most appropriate locations for recreational, economic and environmental stewardship uses and opportunities
- Filtered uses through a Carrying Capacity Analysis defining ability of landscape to support multiple land uses
- Result was Pikes Peak Regional Vision Plan process that created and tested range of future scenarios, refinement process, and evaluation via Confidence Survey taken by Citizen’s Advisory Group
- A prioritized list of projects has been developed that included potential implementation participant
Public Evaluation of Regional Vision Plan: Results Tested by Responses of Citizens Advisory Group to Confidence Survey

- **CAG Summary of Confidence Survey Questions: Yes Proportion**
  - Should CAG have long term involvement? ........................................... 97%
  - Support for Back Country Portal ............................................................. 97%
  - Do you support the concept of the Regional Visitor Center? ................... 95%
  - Is Plan a good representation of those that participated? ....................... 94%
  - Support for Local Access Portal at Colorado Springs ........................ 94%
  - Support for Catamount Portal ................................................................. 94%
  - Support for Perimeter Loop Trail ............................................................. 94%
  - Support for Alternative Routes to Peak ................................................. 94%
  - Support for Restoration Areas ................................................................. 89%
  - Support for Biological Connectedness ................................................. 89%
  - Support for expanding Crags Campground ........................................ 88%
  - Support for Limited Use Areas ................................................................. 86%
  - Would you participate again in the long-term effort ............................ 85%
  - Support for Equestrian Center at Mueller State Park ........................... 85%
  - Support for combined access for Barr Trail and COG ......................... 80%
  - Support for South Slope Portal ............................................................... 79%
  - Support for New Summit House .............................................................. 79%
  - Support for Motorized Area ................................................................. 75%
  - Support for Auto Touring Loop (Scenic Loop) .................................... 69%
  - Support for Lower Gold Camp as a road ............................................ 56%
  - Overall .................................................................................................. 86%
Regional Vision Plan

The Regional Vision Plan includes both a map depicting the physical components as well as a description for each major potential project and how it contributes to the whole vision:

- a Visitor Center
- Scenic Loop
- Perimeter Loop Trail
- Gateway Portals
- Interpretive and Recreation Use Centers
- alternative routes to the Peak.
Management Strategy

• Recommends a specific management framework:
  • A hybrid of the Non-Profit and Independent Models
  • Built upon assumption:
    • various Managing Partners continue to manage their lands independently with support from a non-profit organization focused on coordination and implementation of the Regional Vision Plan
Implementation Strategy

• begins with a prioritized list of concepts and projects to make this Multi-Use Plan attainable.
• These implementation priorities become the action steps needed to achieve the Regional Vision Plan
• A discussion of each project is followed by a potential list of participating agencies and jurisdictions.
• Various implementation tools from federal, state and local agencies are suggested with detailed information provided in the Appendix.
• Potential funding sources based upon the type of development considered is included
Goals

1. *Determine the impact of growth on the surrounding communities of Pikes Peak.*

2. *Develop an environmentally-based plan that establishes the preservation of water quality as its highest priority.*

3. *Develop strategies for balancing the preservation of the Peak with public access and commercial use.*

4. *Identify and protect quality wildlife habitat.*

5. *Describe stewardship programs that encourage the public to behave in ways that will help preserve existing resources.*
The Planning Process
Public Involvement Organization

The initial phase of the planning effort was dedicated to identifying the primary issues, individuals and local resources needed to create a defensible plan that could be supported by all stakeholders. The establishment of a public involvement process was critical to legitimize the planning process and included:

- Key Informant Interviews
- Stakeholder Meetings
- Citizens Advisory Group
- Technical Advisory Group
- Public Surveys
- Public Outreach
Key Involvement Interviews

To help identify primary issues and key participants:

• a series of key informant interviews with local leaders and user group representatives initiated the planning process.

• Thirty-minute interviews were conducted with the identified community leaders and responses were recorded.

• Key Informants expressed the following major values in the interviews:
  • The mountain area should be managed to control negative impacts.
  • The mountain is currently an economic asset with continued potential.
  • Pikes Peak is a spiritual force that affects life in Colorado Springs.
  • Recreational uses and cultural resources should be managed.
Public Outreach Strategy

• To discuss the planning process, a series of public meetings were scheduled throughout the planning process and conducted in the following communities:
  - • Colorado Springs
  - • Woodland Park
  - • Cripple Creek
  - • Manitou Springs
• Later in the process, public input meetings were held to inform and gather comments regarding the Regional Vision Plan.
• A newsletter, called Peak Views was created and each volume was distributed to all participants.
• A website was also designed in conjunction with Colorado Springs Utilities’ home page
Program Definition

The following is a list of the activities (programs) considered to be appropriate that were later recommended in the design alternative phase:

- Agriculture
- Auto touring route
- Backpacking
- Bird watching
- Boating (non-motorized)
- Boy/girl scout camp
- Braille trail
- Camping area (developed)
- Camping area (primitive)
- Cog railway
- Commercial outfitters
- Cross-country skiing
- Environmental education facility
- Exploring
- Hunting
- Interpretive site
- Living history site
- Lodging (cabins)
- Lodging (motel/hotel)
- Lodging (single family homes)
- Logging
- Mineral collecting (rockhounds)
- Mining
- Narrow gauge railroad
- Observatory
- Open space
- Overnight hut system
- Picnic area
- Public transportation shuttle
- Races (automotive)
- Races (bicycle)
- Races (foot)
- Research facility
- Resort Roadless area
- Roads (Pikes Peak Highway)
- Roads (other)
- Rock climbing
- Shooting range
- Shore fishing
- Snowmobiling
- Snowshoeing
- Summit house
- Toilet facilities
- Trailhead parking facilities
- Trails (cross-country skiing)
- Trails (equestrian)
- Trails (hiking)
- Trails (motorized ATV, 4WD, motorcycle)
- Trails (mountain bike)
- Utility corridor
- Visitor center
- Water access site (boat launch)
- Water resource preserve
- Water storage
- Wildlife preserve
Alternative Futures Charrette

Three design teams came together for a three-day charrette to identify future scenarios that offered various potential land uses:

Alternative A -- Stewardship Scenario. This Scenario highlighted program elements with emphasized conservation and educational components and placed environmental values first.

Alternative B -- Community/Recreation Scenario. This Scenario “Recreation Mecca of the Western States” focused on expanding recreation significantly while areas were devoted to either conservation or recreation.

Alternative C -- Economic Scenario. This Scenario “Pikes Peak or Bust.” focused on testing numerous methods to creatively finance public recreation.
Regional Vision Plan

Management of a region such as Pikes Peak cannot be implemented without a clear vision of desired outcomes. The Regional Vision Plan outlines roles and responsibilities for the vested parties and managing authorities for the plan to succeed. Once the Regional Vision Plan was completed, the Managing Partners discussed potential organizational and management models and existing management structures employed in the Pikes Peak region today.

**Pikes Peak Multi-Resource Plan Criteria:**

- System-wide coordination
- Efficiency
- Administrative skills
- Vision thru implementation
- Task expertise
- Multi-resource objectives
Management Strategies

• Land within the boundaries of the Pikes Peak Multi-Use Plan is owned by six different entities and falls into multiple jurisdictions and spheres of influence.

• The recommended management structure for the Pikes Peak Multi-Use Plan is a composite of the Cooperative Management Agreement/Independent/Non-Profit models as described in the Planning Process Section.

• Each landowner implements the plan for their jurisdiction and existing long-standing agreements and partnerships are supported by the Vision Plan.

• This model is supplemented by Leaders of the Vision, Managing Partners, and the Non-Profit Foundation.

• The role of each entity is defined by their policies, land management tools, and relative strengths.
Seeking Potential Organizational Structures for Management

• The project team identified five potential organizational structures that could be utilized to manage the short and long-term operational needs of Pikes Peak Multi-Use Plan area. The desire to accommodate involvement from all Managing Partners, however, should not supersede efforts to streamline and maintain quality decision-making. Given the complex and fragile nature of the subject area, the future operational and advising organization should be both technically skilled and able to facilitate consensus building in order to achieve the following:
  • Administration and Business Management
  • Cooperative landowner relationships
  • Coordination with public landowners
  • Fee collection
  • Fund-raising
  • Interpretive programming
  • Operations and maintenance of the trail systems
  • Patrol and emergency
  • Programming and event staging
  • Resource management
  • Safety and risk management
  • Visitor needs
Organizational Structures for Potential Management

• The agency-led model
• The Non-Profit model
• The Conservation Agency model
• The Independent model
• Cooperative Management Agreements model
The agency-led model

This model presents one agency (U.S. Forest Service, Pikes Peak Ranger District for example) as the lead coordinator for the overall management of the Pikes Peak Multi-Use area.

• Strengths
  • Provides a clear line of communication and leadership
  • with designated authority and funding sources.

• Weaknesses
  • Does not facilitate consensus across all political and ownership boundaries.
  • The agency leading the organization would prescribe their philosophy and legislative authority.

• Example Case Study:
  • proposal for US Forest Service, Pikes Peak Ranger District as coordinating agency
The Non-Profit Model

The non-profit model involves the formation of a volunteer board of directors, who raises money from grants and corporate donations, and hires an Executive Director. The Executive Director would spearhead the non-profit visioning and fund-raising, in concert with the Board of Directors, as well as develop budgets and implementation strategies to realize the vision. A government entity would still be the responsible authority to which the Non-Profit reports.

• Strengths
  • Minimizes "conflicts of interest" issues that other models with multiple agencies may face.
  • Enhances relationships between government agencies and private landowners.
  • Provides an organization to “carry the torch” and be the keepers of the vision.
  • Establishes a regional promotion framework.
  • Develops clear responsibility for fundraising by the non-profit.

• Weakness
  • Limited funds may hinder the level of commitment the Board of Directors is able to generate.
    Funds are the results of fund-raising efforts, which would not supply a steady stream of financial support.

Example Case Study
  • The Appalachian Trail Conference (ATC)
The Conservation Agency Model

The Conservation Agency model is formatted around the hiring of a conservation management agency (i.e., the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) to fulfill the regional vision plan’s stated objectives.

• Strengths
  • Model led by a group whose sole purpose is to heighten conservation efforts. The future of the land and its ability to sustain targeted uses would be the primary focus of the managing organization.
  • Agreements of the best management practices would be minimized, and all individual interests could be pursued with limited conflict.
The Independent Model

The Independent Model allows each type of landowner (public and private) to manage their part of a defined area. For example, Colorado Springs Utilities would manage their watershed, the U.S. Forest Service Pikes Peak Ranger District would manage their lands, etc. Each individual or group may agree to manage their part of the Multi-Use area, consistent with a single management strategy, but day-to-day operations and management would be site specific.

- **Strengths**
  - Each landowner and operator manages land based on their own jurisdiction of it.
  - Agreements of the best management practices would be minimized, and all individual interests could be pursued with limited conflict.

- **Weaknesses**
  - Individual interests could lead to controversy if not managed as a team effort.

- **Example Case Study:**
  - Mt. Washington Observatory, located in New Hampshire is managed by a group that includes both public and private landowners
Cooperative Management Agreements Model

The Cooperative Management Agreement engages the sustained involvement of the local host community residents and their governments, recreation-tourism business and industry, and public land management agencies.

• **Strengths**
  • Builds community consensus and synergy among all stakeholders.

• **Weaknesses**
  • The decision-making process may be hindered by the complex nature of "everyone is at the table" type of organization.
  • Technical expertise is limited to those involved.

• **Example Case Study:**
  • The Owl Mountain Partnership is a prototype for ecosystem management in North Park, Colorado
Comparison of Alternative Management Models

Major Attributes

- Non-Profit and Conservation Agency Models:
  - Management, operations and project implementation are the key strengths
- Agency-Led Model:
  - main focus is the implementation of projects and day-to-day responsibilities
  - it is limited in the areas of fund-raising, administration and its ability to influence private landowners.
- Cooperative Management Agreement Model:
  - only exhibits moderate strengths in day-to-day responsibilities
  - but it is least capable to raise funds, vision, and promote the Pikes Peak region.
- Independent Model:
  - is the weakest model in a number of categories and shows only moderate capabilities for operations and maintenance.

RECOMMENDATION

- Based on strengths and weaknesses inherent in the Independent Model, it is recommended that a hybrid management model be implemented to enhance the currently employed Model
Comparison of Model Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions &amp; Capabilities Required</th>
<th>Agency Led</th>
<th>Non-Profit</th>
<th>Conservation Agency</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Cooperative Management Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Business Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Trails and Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devise, build and maintain educational program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response (fire/ambulance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-Raising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat/Environmental Restoration (Design &amp; Implement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence Private Landowners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-agency/Municipality Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Capabilities (Patrol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming &amp; Event Staging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management (Water/Timber/Wildlife/T&amp;R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Survey (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (safety/maintenance/construction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash pickup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Risk Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very Capable
Moderately Capable
Minimally Capable
Pikes Peak Multi-Use Plan: Colorado Springs to Cripple Creek

Landscape Level
Schematic Vision
Projects Forming Regional Vision Plan

- Projects in the Regional Vision Plan are uses and activities at the site-specific scale that incorporate many of the regional concepts previously described. Planning and design for projects is based on existing or proposed concepts from local planning documents that coincide with the objectives of the Regional Vision Plan.

- Projects
  - Regional Visitor Center
  - Manitou Springs Gateway
  - Cascade Gateway
  - Green Mountain Falls Gateway
  - Woodland Park Gateway
  - Colorado Springs Gateway
  - Cripple Creek & Victor Gateways
  - Divide Gateway
  - Gillett Portal
  - Crystola Portal
  - Chipita Park Portal
  - Catamount Ranch Open Space
  - Enhanced Barr Camp Portal
  - Crags Campground Portal
  - Mueller State Park Portal
  - South Slope Portal
  - Wye Campground Portal
  - Back Country Portal
  - Cheyenne Canyon Portal and
  - Environmental Education Center
  - Gold Camp Road
  - Pikes Peak Highway
Implementation Priorities

- The scope of the Regional Vision Plan addresses an area of more than 128,000 acres.
- Many of the Plan recommendations are based on projects that partially exist today such as trails and motorized roadways.
- Public recognition of the full range of recreational opportunities has not been realized.
- New significant concepts and major potential projects have been recommended to address the deficiencies.
- Proposed framework of recreational connections and opportunities include:
  - The Regional Visitor Center
  - The Scenic Loop
  - The Perimeter Loop
For More Information:

The 1999 Pikes Peak Multi Use Plan Document

El Pomar Foundation Pikes Peak Heritage Series:
https://www.elpomar.org/programs/pikes-peak-heritage-series/